

knowingly and materially to the efforts by Iran or Iraq to acquire destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons. The mandatory sanctions include a suspension of U.S. bilateral assistance, a requirement that the United States oppose multilateral loans to that country, a suspension of codevelopment or coproduction agreements, a suspension of military and dual-use technical exchange agreements, and a ban on exports of products on the U.S. munitions list, all for a period of one year. The legislation does contain a Presidential national security waiver, Mr. Speaker, but the outrageous thing is that the President has not even bothered to issue the waiver. He is simply ignoring the law. So apparently, is the author of the law.

Worse, this administration is ignoring the threat. And the threat comes not only from the rogue nation of Iran, but from its rogue supplier, Communist China. The instances of weapons and dangerous technology transfers by this outlaw nation are too numerous to list, and so is the number of times that the Clinton administration has responded with outright capitulation. This will only beget more of the same Mr. Speaker.

The travesty is that one day young American men and women may find themselves in a fight with any number of nations that have been armed and supplied by Communist China, and we will then have to ask ourselves why we didn't try to stop these dangerous transfers sooner.

IRAN TRIPLES GULF DEPLOYED MISSILES— U.S. NAVY

(By Diana Abdallah)

DUBAI, July 15.—Iran has in the past two years tripled the number of missiles deployed on its Gulf coast and is fitting Chinese-built cruise missiles on up to 20 of its naval boats, a senior U.S. navy commander said on Monday.

Vice Admiral John Scott Redd, Commander of the U.S. Fifth Fleet and Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Central Command, said Iran's acquisition of Chinese-built radar guided C-802 anti-ship missiles was "a new dimension" in the regional naval threat.

He told Reuters from his headquarters in Bahrain that Iraq and Iran continued to pose a threat to security in the region which produces a third of the world's oil supply.

Redd said there were no indications of threats against U.S. naval forces following two bombs that killed 24 Americans in Saudi Arabia in the past year, but that the navy had taken "prudent measures." He did not elaborate.

"Iraq is the major land threat in the region . . . Because it still has the most capable and largest ground force in the region, while Iran is more of a naval threat," said Redd, who ends his assignment on Wednesday to return to Washington.

He said Iran was expected to have up to 20 patrol boats fitted with anti-ship Chinese-built C-802 cruise missiles.

It already has two Russian Kilo submarines "and they have another one coming we think before the year is out," he said.

"There has been a tripling of shore-based missiles both that shoot at ships and those that are surface-to-air missiles," he said. "The number they have deployed on the Gulf coast and in the Strait (of Hormuz) roughly tripled."

"The newest dimension is that they have Chinese-built C-802 missiles against ships . . . The Houdong patrol craft they got from China came fitted to fire the C-802s and they have now received all 10 of them. Some arrived in the last couple of months."

"They are also taking some of the other patrol craft and modifying them to carry the missiles and the work is in progress. We could be looking at 20 or more patrol ships at sea capable of carrying those surface-to-surface missiles," he said.

Officials in the United States, which accuses Iran of sponsoring terrorism and has imposed sanctions on it, have expressed concern since the 1991 Gulf War about what they say is Iran's growing military capability and aims in the region.

Iran has rejected all these charges.

Redd said U.S. forces were capable of dealing with any Iranian military threat.

Navy spokesman Commander T. McCreary said 34 U.S. vessels, including an aircraft carrier group, cruisers, destroyers—some capable of firing TOMAHAWK cruise missiles—frigates and submarines, were currently deployed in Central Command area, most of them in Gulf waters.

Up to 15,000 sailors and marines are stationed in the area.

LEONARD AND RUBY BASSETT CELEBRATE GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1996

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to commemorate Leonard and Ruby Bassett on their golden wedding anniversary. The Bassetts' children, Leonard Jr., Dennis, Leatha, and Oddette, are hosting a joyous celebration honoring their parents' 50 years of love, friendship and devotion. This event will be held this Saturday, July 20, 1996, at the Genesis Convention Center in Gary, IN.

While in their early twenties Leonard Bassett and Ruby Holman met in the spring of 1946 at a dance hall located across from Froebel High School in Gary. Mr. Bassett had just returned from 28 months of service in the U.S. Navy and resolved to attend a dance that was being held for young adults. It was there that they first met. The two knew of each other during their years at Roosevelt High School, but they did not formally meet until this magical night at the dance.

After courting for a couple of months, the two discovered that they shared the same dreams of settling down and starting a family. After a short period of dating, Leonard and Ruby knew that they had found true love and that they were destined to be partners in life. Shortly thereafter, Leonard and Ruby were joined in holy matrimony on July 21, 1946.

During the Bassetts' 50 years of marriage they had 4 children: Leonard, Jr., Dennis, Leatha, and Oddette. The Bassetts are thankful that, following graduation from Roosevelt High School, all four of their children were able to continue on to higher education and establish themselves in their respective careers.

In 1983, Leonard retired from U.S. Steel after devoting 37 years of his life to the steel industry. Leonard retired as a production foreman. When Ruby retired, she was head cook of the Gary Community School Corp. Currently, she is a part-time employee with the Lake County government. Ruby is also a precinct committee person and co-captain of the fifth precinct in Gary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other colleagues to join me in congratulating the

Bassetts as they celebrate 50 years of marriage. In today's world, it is refreshing to see two people who have devoted their lives to creating a successful marriage and happy family. May the Bassetts be a positive role model for today's young couples who are starting families. They are proof that a little dedication and a lot of love can make marriage one of life's most magnificent experiences.

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT— PERSONAL EXPLANATION

SPEECH OF

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage:

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, on July 12, 1996, there was a vote for final passage of H.R. 3396, the Defense of Marriage Act. On rollcall vote No. 316, as you can see from my statement on this issue, which is attached, I intended to vote against that bill, but in my haste to get to the airport so that I could get my plane to Chicago and my district, I inadvertently pushed the green button and was, therefore, recorded as having voted for the bill.

I want my constituents to know I intended to vote against that bill:

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment that suspends the definition of marriage for any State that adopts a different definition through its normal democratic process.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called Defense of Marriage Act should really be called the Republican Offense on People Who are Different Act because it is nothing more than blatant homophobic gay-bashing.

The conservative elements of our American society have often discriminated against and tried to prevent whatever they didn't like or didn't understand, it hasn't been so long ago that blacks and whites weren't allowed to marry in any State. So, devoted couples pledged their commitment to caring for each other in private ceremonies, their children were considered illegitimate, and the spouses were not legally entitled to inherit from their partners, nor share in any public benefits.

And, not so long ago, 50 States and the District of Columbia had very different laws about who could marry, the age the partners had to be, the length of the waiting period between applying for a marriage license and the ceremony—and they still do. Even now there are different laws about divorce, about residency requirements to obtain a divorce, about the kind of alimony or support one spouse has to pay to another, and many other differences. The Federal Government sorts out who is eligible to benefit from public support from these spouses and former spouses, even as people move from one State to another; and the Federal Government can and will continue to sort these issues out as they become timely, which this Offense on Marriage Act is not.

The issue of who should marry within a State are the proper jurisdiction of the individual States. My grandmother probably couldn't envision a time when interracial marriages would be legal in America, but

today they are. One kind of discrimination is just as onerous as another, and neither should be tolerated. For the Republican majority of this Congress to be taking up this bill, which attempts to usurp States' rights, makes a farce of their frequent rallying cry to limit Federal intrusion into the personal lives of America's citizens. However, when it concerns a woman's right to choose, or in this case the rights of adults to choose their life partners, the Republicans abandon their mantra of preserving States' rights.

This bill should be defeated and I urge my colleagues to use their common sense and leave this issue up to the States. It is homophobic and discriminatory, and it attempts to address a situation that should be left up to the States. It is not the proper jurisdiction of the Congress or the Constitution.

As I walk past the Republican side of the aisle, I expect to hear something similar to an old joke from the civil rights era: "Some of my good friends are gay, I just wouldn't want my son or daughter to marry one."

My response is that: that's their own personal, private business.

THE CONTINUING STRIKE IN CYPRUS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1996

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recall the unprovoked Turkish invasion of Cyprus on July 20, 1974, and the strife that still exists on the island as a result of Turkish aggression.

After Cyprus gained independence from Great Britain in 1960, the island, whose population remains nearly 80 percent Greek, experienced clashes between the Greek and Turkish communities. Despite the overwhelmingly Greek population and culture dating back to ancient times, the Turkish government invaded Cyprus during a transition in political rule. Turkish forces invaded the northern coast of the island and soon amassed 30,000 troops that quickly overwhelmed the unexpected Greek Cypriot population. Although the U.N. Security Council negotiated peace talks, the Turkish forces controlled 37 percent of Cyprus by August, leaving one-third of the Cypriot population homeless and more than 1,600 persons still unaccounted for to this day—including 5 Americans.

Now, 22 years later, Cyprus remains divided despite repeated attempts at peace talks. Greek Cypriots who lived in towns for generations now stare across a barbed-wire fence that divides them from the Turkish controlled section of their homeland where their homes, property, and churches have been destroyed. This 112-mile border that divides the Greek south from the Turkish-controlled north, is as tense as the old Berlin Wall. U.N. troops still patrol this partition that has existed since the Turkish invasion.

Mr. Speaker, after 22 years of cold war, sharp division, unanswered questions, and tension created by Turkish actions since 1974, there must be a resolution and settlement since this situation is tragic for Greek Cypriots and a real danger to greater European peace and security.

Cyprus should be a free and open state and those responsible for the tragedies and crimes

of the past and present should be held accountable and brought to justice.

ALASKANS ARE THE BEST STEWARDS OF ALASKA LANDS AND RESOURCES

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring the attention of my colleagues to a guest opinion that appeared in the June issue of *Resource Review*. It is by Jake Adams, an Inupiat Eskimo who is both a whaling captain and president of the Arctic Slope Regional Corp. He makes the important point that Alaskans are the best stewards of Alaska lands and resources, not the political leaders and activists who live here in Washington, DC. The text of his opinion follows my remarks.

Just as Eskimo self-regulation under the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission has succeeded in protecting both the Bowhead Whale and the communities that depend on the whale for subsistence, I believe that the resources of the Tongass National Forest will be best managed by the State of Alaska, as I propose in H.R. 2413. Time and time again Alaskans have proven their ability to manage their resources responsibly, an accomplishment, as Mr. Adams points out, that Washington, DC, cannot claim.

I hope that my colleagues will read the wise words of Mr. Adams.

[From the *Resource Review*, June 1996]

ALASKA—A PLACE THAT WORKS

(By Jacob Adams)

Compared to the rest of the nation, Alaskans enjoy a relatively untouched, pristine environment. This fact has led some people who have mismanaged their own environment and communities to view Alaska as a public museum; a place they want to control and preserve, untouched and suspended in time.

This, of course, does not work well for those of us who live in Alaska, have families to support, communities to nurture and shareholders' economic interests to protect and advance. Yet, many Alaskans often find that they are forced to be major actors in contentious national debates over the use of public lands and resources and, in some cases, even their own private lands and resources.

It is a shame that many political leaders and activists who live and work in the middle of the poverty, crime and hopelessness of Washington, D.C.—a city that does not work—are determined to second-guess so much of what we Alaskans do and aspire for.

Alaska, after all, is a place that works. We educate our children. We meet our people's needs. We protect our fish and wildlife. We believe in the work ethic. And we take care of our poor and disadvantaged.

Profit is not a dirty word in Alaska. Free enterprise works here. It is part of a proud American tradition that produces income, jobs and tax revenue. It improves the quality of people's lives. But, it can also be a hard task master.

Those of us who live on the North Slope have seen some successes and a fair share of failures. One success story that continues today is the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission (AEWC). In the late 1970s, the International Whaling Commission, elements of

the federal government and animal rights activists pushed hard to terminate my people's traditional subsistence hunts for the Bowhead Whale. We fought those efforts. We proposed a system of Eskimo "self-regulation" through AEWC. Who better to protect the species and regulate the hunt than the people whose subsistence and culture is at stake?

We were successful. Today, the whales, our people and our culture are thriving. And we did it by ourselves. Self-regulation by the parties who stand to lose or gain is a concept which should be used more by the state and federal governments.

But, we have also seen some failures. ASRC and its shareholders—working with the State, RDC, Arctic Power and our Congressional Delegation, have tried very hard since 1987 to open the small, oil rich Coastal Plain area of ANWR to oil and gas leasing. We own 92,160 acres of Coastal Plain land in the huge 19 million acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. But we are denied the benefits of our resources. We are prohibited by federal law from producing and using oil or natural gas on our privately-owned lands in ANWR at the village of Kaktovik. Instead, the federal government's action means that we must import fuel oil to heat village homes and generate electricity. Yet, Kaktovik sits on the nation's best prospect for major new oil and gas reserves.

We have been fighting this issue for nine years. We may have to fight for nine or ten more. Lifting the Alaska oil export ban took 22 years.

We will continue to push to open the Coastal Plain because it is the right thing to do. Alaskans are the best stewards of our land, our environment and our fish and wildlife resources. We should be major participants in discussions about our future. We do not need the failed landlords of Washington to dictate their policies of failure to us and our children.

My people have seen ups and we have seen downs. But we do not dwell on short-term reverses or disappointments. In the long run, rational thought and the laws of economics will prevail. The fundamental changes taking place in Russia, our neighbors to the west, were not conceivable ten years ago.

Alaskans need to have staying power. We are in this for the long run. Jacob Adams is the President of the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, a member of the North Slope Borough Assembly and a whaling captain in Barrow. Jake also serves on the Board of Directors for RDC.

NEW PAYMENT SYSTEM FOR PPS EXEMPT REHABILITATION HOSPITALS AND UNITS

HON. FRANK A. LOBIONDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1996

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I introduce legislation to provide for a Medicare prospective payment system [PPS] for inpatient rehabilitation hospital and rehabilitation unit services.

Prior to 1983, the Medicare Act paid hospitals the reasonable cost of treating Medicare patients. Generally, this meant that the more a hospital spent, the more it was paid from the Medicare Trust Fund. The result was a rapid rate of increase in Medicare spending for hospitalization. In 1983, this system was replaced with a Prospective Payment System under which hospitals were paid fixed rates for various types of diagnostic groups, commonly